

## REMARKS

Claims 17-29 are withdrawn. Claims 1-16 and 30-48 are pending. Claims 49-50 are new.

As a preliminary matter, the undersigned appreciates Examiner Manuel providing notice that the previous response to the restriction requirement was not fully responsive to the United States Patent & Trademark Office's (USPTO) communication of May 3, 2006. The docketing department had inadvertently docketed the communication as merely a restriction requirement.

Claims 3, 6-10 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 3, 6-8, and 32 are amended and claims 9-10 are cancelled to address the issues raised in the Office Action.

Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-16, 30-31, 33-41, 43, and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based upon US Patent No. 5,676,694 issued to Boser et al. Claims 8, 14, 32, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon Boser.

Boser is directed to a medical electrical lead having an elongated lead body provided with an internal longitudinally extending lumen carrying an elongated stranded or cabled conductor and an electrode coil, located on said lead body. Claim 1 of the present application is directed to a medical electrical lead that includes “an elongate lead body; a conductive coil extending along a portion of the lead body; a conductive wire or cable extending along a portion of the lead body; and a conductive component.” The conductive component “coupl[es] the coil to the wire or cable and including a first side, a second side opposing the first side, a first groove formed in the first side and a second groove formed in the second side.” “[T]he first groove holds a portion of the wire or cable and the second groove holds a portion of the coil.” The first and second grooves include a first and second longitudinal openings, respectively. The USPTO appears to equate the second groove of the claimed invention to sleeve 312’s tubular portion, which is enclosed along the longitudinal portion of the tube.

Applicants respectfully submit that the term “second groove” distinguishes the claimed invention from Boser’s tubular portion.

Applicants’ respectfully challenge the USPTO’s inherency argument. The USPTO asserts that it is inherent to strip a wire, place the uninsulated wire into a crimping sleeve, then crimp the sleeve. Applicants could have used insulation displacement techniques in place of the operation described in the present application. Given that there is more than one way to achieve a certain result, the Applicants respectfully request that the USPTO support its assertion that that it is inherent to strip a wire, place the uninsulated wire into a crimping sleeve, then crimp the sleeve.

Additionally, Applicants request clarification as to what limitations are believed to be well known. In the Office Action, the USPTO provides a paragraph with a list of limitations along with the term “well known.” Applicants are uncertain as which limitation is considered “well known.” Applicants do assert, however, that welding the wire into the *second groove* is not well known. It is respectfully requested that the USPTO provide further clarification of its position. Withdrawal of the instant rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

---

June 18, 2007  
Date

---

/Carol F. Barry/  
Carol F. Barry  
Reg. No. 41,600  
(763) 514-4673  
Customer No. 27581